



TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON

300 Pantigo Place – Suite 105
East Hampton, New York 11937-2684

Planning Department
JoAnne Pahwul
Director

Telephone (631) 324-2178
Fax (631) 324-1476

SITE PLAN/SPECIAL PERMIT EVALUATION

Home Sweet Home

SCTM#300-197-2-16 & 300-192-2-3.2

App#:

Prepared by: Marco Wu, Planner *MW* *JP*

Date: June 17, 2020

1. APPLICATION INFORMATION

A. INFORMATION RECEIVED: Following Received (04/17/2020)

- Site Plan/Special Permit Application
- Land Survey dated (02/07/2020) prepared by Gregory S. Gallas of Gallas Surveying Group
- Floor Plans and Elevations dated (03/11/2020) prepared by Frank G. Relf of Frank G. Relf Architect, P.C.
- Site Plan dated (02/19/2020) prepared by Marc Pilotta, PE

B. DATE SUBMITTED: April 13, 2020

C. OWNER: Home Sweet Home Moving & Storage Co., Inc

D. APPLICANT/AGENT: Matthews, Kirst & Cooley, PLLC c/o Brian E. Mathews

E. SCHOOL DISTRICT: Wainscott

F. STREET NAME: 342 Montauk Highway

G. TYPE OF STREET: State

H. ZONING DISTRICT: CI: Commercial Industrial

I. SEQRA - TYPE OF ACTION: Type II

J. INVOLVED AGENCIES: N/A

K. OTHER REVIEW: Office of Fire Prevention

2. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

A. PROPOSED USE(S) AS CLASSIFIED BY TOWN CODE: Unlisted Non-Nuisance Industry (self-storage facility)

B. EXISTING USE(S) AS CLASSIFIED BY TOWN CODE: Warehouse

C. ARE THE EXISTING & PROPOSED USES PERMITTED OR

SPECIAL PERMITTED BY THE TOWN CODE? Permitted

- D. AREA OF PARCEL (SQUARE FEET):** 41,208 sq. ft.
- E. MOST RECENT CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY:** 10/28/16 - C.O. 32041 (61753) - HOME SWEET HOME MOVING AND STORAGE - 1448 SQ. FT. ADDITION, 578 SQ. FT. CONCRETE PLATFORM, 974 SQ. FT. CONCRETE SLAB, 221 SQ. FT. LOAD PLATFORM, 2591 SQ. FT. ROOF OVER PRE EXISTING CONCRETE PAVEMENT AT EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING.
- F. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES:** Four (4) individual storage buildings, one with an addition, with covered concrete area at center of complex
- G. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES:** N/a
- H. EXISTING & PROPOSED LOT COVERAGE:** 27,810 sq. ft. 67.5%
- I. EXISTING & PROPOSED TOTAL COVERAGE:** 35,114 sq. ft. 85.2%
- J. HEIGHT OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES:** N/a
- K. NUMBER OF STORIES OF PROPOSED STRUCTURES:** N/a
- L. NUMBER OF EXISTING PARKING SPACES:** 6 plus 1 ADA compliant parking space
- M. NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES REQUIRED:** See issues for discussion
- N. TOTAL PARKING SPACES PROVIDED:** Seven (7)
- O. VARIANCES REQUIRED:** See issues for discussion
- P. DOES EXISTING & PROPOSED LIGHTING COMPLY WITH BOARD POLICY?** See issues for discussion
- Q. DISTANCE TO PUBLIC WATER:** @ Montauk Highway
- R. SOURCE OF WATER SUPPLY:** Public
- S. TYPE OF SANITARY SYSTEM:** See issues for discussion
- T. ARE EXISTING & PROPOSED SANITARY SYSTEMS DEPICTED:** None are depicted
- U. DO SANITARY CALCULATIONS COMPLY WITH SCDHS STANDARDS?** Not provided
- V. NUMBER OF ACCESS POINTS:** See issues for discussion
- W. IS SIGHT DISTANCE ACCEPTABLE?** To be determined
- X. IS THE PROPOSAL ADA COMPLIANT?** See issues for discussion

3. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 255 (LIST ITEMS AND SECTION FOR THOSE ITEMS NOT SUBMITTED)

4. SITE ANALYSIS:

- A. SOIL TYPE:** CuB: Cut and fill land, gently sloping
- B. FLOOD HAZARD ZONE:** X
- C. DESCRIPTION OF VEGETATION:** 100% Cleared
- D. RANGE OF ELEVATIONS:** 31 ft. – 33ft.
- E. NATURE OF SLOPES:** Flat to gently sloping
- F. TYPE OF WETLANDS WITHIN NRSP JURISDICTION:** N/a
- G. SETBACK FROM ANY WETLAND OR WATER BODY:** N/a
- H. ARE THERE TRAILS ON SITE?** No

- I. DEPTH TO WATER TABLE:** Not provided
- J. DOES THE SITE CONTAIN HISTORIC OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES?** None have been identified
- K. AGRICULTURAL DATA STATEMENT REQUIRED:** N/a
- L. IS THE SITE CONTAINED WITHIN:**

| | |
|---|----|
| NYS Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat | No |
| Local Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat | No |
| US Fish & Wildlife Significant Ecological Complex | No |
| PEP CLPS list | No |
| Town Community Preservation Fund List | No |
| Recommended Scenic Area of Statewide Significance | No |
| Suffolk County designated Pine Barrens | No |
| South Fork Special Groundwater Protection Area | No |
| Town Overlay District | No |

Other Background Information:

Site Plan application has been made to convert an existing commercial warehouse into a self-storage facility. The proposed plans seek to add additional floors to existing structures increasing the gross floor area from 27,810 square feet to 55,678 square feet. As illustrated in the Site Plan, Area A remains a single floor; Areas B, C, and D will add an additional floor doubling their square footage including space for an elevator; Area E will add an additional two floors for the installation of an elevator and lobby; Area F remains a single floor; and Area G add an additional two floors. The project contains approximately (465) self-storage units of various sizes. The parcel is located in Wainscott on the corner of Georgica Drive and Montauk Highway. It is zoned CI: Commercial Industrial and is 100% cleared of native vegetation.

As the Board may remember, other Site Plans have been submitted recently at this location, specifically T-Mobile Northeast LLC @ Home Sweet Home Wainscott. This plan was approved and will have some changes on the current application that will be discussed below.



Home Sweet Home (facing Montauk Highway)



Home Sweet Home (facing Montauk Highway)



Home Sweet Home (facing Georgica Drive)



Home Sweet Home (end of Georgica Drive)

Issue: Prior Site Plan

As noted, a prior Site Plan involving the installation of cellular service equipment will make changes to the currently proposed Site Plan for self-storage units. This change is located on the Northern side of the building where a proposed outdoor staircase and trash enclosure are located. With the approval of the prior Site Plan, the staircase and trash enclosure will not be built due to the installation of cell service equipment.

The Board may wish to request the applicant submit Site Plans reflecting their alterations and address their replacements due to their prior plan.

Issue: Parking

There are currently no defined parking requirements for a self-storage facility. However, there have been recent Site Plan approvals of self-storage facilities that provide a general sense of minimum parking. The Twin Forks Moving and Storage Site Plan provided (13) spaces for roughly 79,000 sq. ft. of “mini – storage”, around 1 space per 6,000 sq. ft. The mentioned application stated that 2 or 3 people will be in the office during 9AM to 5PM Monday to Friday. Similarly, the Snyder Phased Commercial Site Plan provided (11) spaces and a handicap space for roughly 20,000 sq. ft. of self-storage, around 1 space per 1,600 sq. ft. It was noted that Snyder Commercial will have no on-site employees.

In contrast, Home Sweet Home proposes (6) spaces and a handicap space for 55,678 sq. ft., or 1 space per 7,954 sq. ft. The application has a designated office area, so there will be some form of staff working on-site full time. While there are loading docks located in the middle with parking space available, it does not appear that it is intended for patrons and is instead for the parking and offloading of company vehicles.

Both Twin Forks and Snyder Phased Commercial are located in relatively low-traveled locations whereas Home Sweet Home is located on the highest-volume traffic area of Town which is Montauk Highway.

In addition to the loading docks located in the middle of the site, an additional (2) are located along the Western side next to Georgica Drive and these docks appear to provide the main loading and unloading areas for the self-storage units. An important detail to keep in mind is that the loading docks on the Western Side currently operate close to the right of way of Georgica Drive and that loading and unloading will likely necessitate parking in the street right of way. A combination of the neighboring gas station and increased commercial activity of Home Sweet Home may cause potential conflicts in traffic flow. In addition, patrons may be inclined to temporarily park their vehicles on the side should the parking lot be at maximum capacity.

ADA Comments pending

The Planning Department is currently waiting to receive comments from Chief Fire Marshall David Browne regarding the ADA accessibility of the proposed Site Plan.

ADA Corridor concerns

The Planning Department has raised the question of whether or not the aisles proposed in the Sections A, B, C, D, and G will be ADA compatible for individuals using wheelchairs due to their narrowness. Corners and bends may be difficult to navigate for those individuals and also patrons with large packages. The Planning Department has reached out to the Fire Department regarding this concern and is awaiting response.

Sanitary System

No existing or proposed sanitary plans have been submitted for the application at the time of submission. The expanded retail space will increase the sanitary flow on the lot and therefore appears to trigger the requirement for an upgraded sanitary system in following Chapter 210-3-2 Subsection B, part (5) of the Town Code.

In addition to the conditions provided for in Subsection A, for all the following circumstances, the sanitary systems installed must be, or the current sanitary system must be upgraded to, a low-nitrogen sanitary system as defined in § 210-1-4:

(5) All nonresidential properties that require site plan review pursuant to § 255-6-30B(2), (4) or (5).

255-6-30 B. (4) Any other activity or land use which increases the occupancy limits of a building or increases site parking requirements.

Given the age of the lot, it's highly likely the sanitary system is not a low-nitrogen septic system. It is noted that there is limited space in which to locate a new low-nitrogen septic system. Existing and proposed sanitary flow calculations based on the square footage of the various uses and the existing and proposed sanitary system need to be depicted on the site plan.

Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS)

The greatly increased square footage for commercial activity will increase the sanitary flow of the lot to some degree. The change in sanitary flow and sanitary systems will require approval from the Suffolk County Department of Health Services. The applicants are encouraged to submit an application to this agency as soon as possible if they have not already done so.

Landscaping

The location of existing landscaping remains mostly the same however the applicant has proposed replacing the majority with other types. A mix of 18"-24" high Feather Reed Grass, 24"-30" high Inkberry, and 24"-30" high Anthony Waterer Spiraea has been proposed along the front of the building facing Montauk Highway. The Planning Department recommends that the applicant use Bayberry (*Myrica pennsylvanica*), a native plant, instead of the Waterer Spiraea.

It appears that the applicant is proposing to replace the existing landscaping along Georgica Drive with a mixture of 18"-24" high Feather Reed Grass, 24"-30" high Inkberry, and six 4'-5' high Skyrocket Juniper. Upon a site visit the existing landscaping located in between the loading docks was shown to be mature Junipers well over 6 feet high. That specific area is to be replaced with Feather Reed Grass and Inkberry's that only be approximately 24" at planting and will not be as tall upon maturity. The Planning Department recommends that the existing evergreen shrubs in this area be retained so as to provide better visual buffering of the metal sided building. The applicant should clarify their motivation for replacing the existing Junipers.



Home Sweet Home Landscaping (along Georgica Drive)

Lighting

The applicant has submitted a lighting plan including a key to the proposed fixtures that indicates that lighting will be fully shielded and at the maximum of 3000 Kelvin. The Planning Department recommends that the applicant submit specification sheets from the manufacturer's website or brochure to substantiate the specifications.

An area of concern are the lighting fixtures proposed along the loading docks along the Western side. The applicant proposes the use of LED lights under the roofed portions that raise the foot candle levels above the Board's lighting policy recommended levels of five (5) foot candles for active entrances. The smaller loading dock reaches upwards of nine (9) foot candles whereas the larger one has multiple areas over ten (10) foot candles. The manufacturer's specification sheets will be needed to verify that these fixtures are fully shielded.

Given the close proximity of the loading docks to Georgica Drive, there will be some light that spills over onto the road. The lighting plan shows that the light levels in Georgica Drive, near the two loading docks, will be 2.1 and 3.4 foot candles. §255-1-80 C. of the Town Code provides that no light source shall be visible beyond the property line including from roadways and the Board's lighting policy call for 0.1 foot candles at the property line.

The mounting height for ten (10) of the fixtures is 16' 6" and 16' 9", whereas the Town Code requires that light fixtures be mounted at the lowest practical height with a goal of mounting no greater than 12'. It is noted that there are second and third floor exterior staircases that may require lighting. In other areas, the mounting height should be revised. The fixtures should be depicted on the elevation drawings so that the location can be determined.

Some of the light fixtures appear to be associated with proposed signs on the building. This lighting is in the purview of the Architectural Review Board and not the Planning Board and therefore should be removed from the lighting plan.

The key to the lighting plan should be revised to include the method of control. Motion controls are the most consistent with the Board's lighting policy. If timers or manual switches are proposed, the hours of operation should be indicated in the key, with lighting being shut off no later than one hour after the close of business.

Architectural Review Board (ARB)

The proposed project will require the approval of the ARB and an application should be submitted to this agency as soon as possible if the applicants have not already done so. The applicant has proposed the installation of two-story tall window panes on the Southwestern corner of their building in addition to an overhang for the smaller loading dock. These windows will greatly alter the exterior community character of the building. The smaller loading dock which will have the new overhang is currently using a garage door and will be replaced with what appears to be pedestrian glass doors that will not be ADA accessible due to the loading dock stairs. Additionally, leading up to the smaller loading dock is a proposed concrete sidewalk. This sidewalk will be built within the easement surpassing the lot line of the property. The applicant has also proposed new signage on the Western side and on the front of the building facing Montauk Highway. The signage differs to the existing signs and their appearances will require approval from the ARB. In addition, elevation plans and artist's renditions of the project indicate that there will be new stone/concrete bricks along the base of the building and on the Southern side for the new landscaping area. Given the location of the Site on Montauk Highway, the Board may wish to discuss sending comments to the ARB.

SEQRA

The project is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA and Chapter 128 of the Town Code. It is recommended that the Planning Board request lead agency status for the project.

Title of Plans

The Site Plan and Landscape & Lighting Plan should be revised to reflect the name that the application was filed under, Home Sweet Home.

All plans submitted for this application, including but not limited to site plans, drainage plans, and landscaping and lighting plans, must be labeled with the title of the project. This title must be consistent with the title that the application was filed under unless an official request is made to modify the application name. All correspondence submitted should also be consistent with this title. This consistency is essential for record keeping purposes and any plans not so labeled will be required to be revised accordingly.

Planning Board Consensus

Should the applicant address the removal of the northernmost staircase and trash enclosure due to a prior site plan?

Additional comments: _____

Should the applicant address the level of parking given its increased use in a high traffic area?

Additional comments: _____

Should the applicant submit sanitary plans including the sanitary flows of existing and proposed sanitary systems?

Additional comments: _____

Should the applicant address the proposal to remove existing mature landscaping and with a replacement that will have a lower height at planting and upon maturity?

Additional comments: _____

Should the applicant revised the lighting plan as discussed above and provide manufacturer specification sheets?

Additional comments: _____

Should the Board send comments to the ARB regarding the exterior changes of the Site Plan?

Additional comments: _____

Additional Board Comments:
